

OGC Has Reviewed

OGC 60-1308a

21 OCT 1960

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Support)

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Report on Training in CIA

1. This memorandum is for information only.

2. On the whole I believe the Inspector General's report on Agency training is a valuable contribution. It strikes me as comprehensive, well-expressed, and thoughtful. Its recommendations have little or no impact on this office, so our comments below are mainly personal reactions except where otherwise noted.

3. The recommendation on clerical training in effect merely raises a question. A fresh look cannot hurt and may bring some improvements. On clerical usage, this office probably does make better than average use of shorthand capability, and we have made use of the shorthand refresher courses which have been effective according to the capability of the individual stenographer.

4. In connection with the recommendation for a board of overseers to improve communication on the training programs, I think some experimentation is worth trying but I hope it would not stop with briefings, no matter how detailed, and project investigation as suggested on page 38. It seems to me that such senior grade officers must find time to actually live with the problem for a reasonable period of time, whatever that may be.

25X1A6b

5. In connection with the recommendation on reserve training, members of this office who are active in the Reserves have the following comments:

a. On page 52 the Inspector General makes the following recommendation. "The DTR confer with the Commanding Officers of the Army and Air Reserve

~~SECRET~~

units to see if more practical reserve training, e. g., International Communism, could be handled by OTR for the reservists."

b. There is no disagreement with this recommendation as such, and in fact the reserve program for the forthcoming year includes a study of International Communism. In the body of the report, however, it is stated specifically that the training facilities [redacted] are not able to meet requirements of both the Contingency Task Force and the Reserve Officers active duty program. Certainly this is the best possible reason for suspending the latter program. However, there is considerable discussion devoted to the fact that such a program was inappropriate and it is this point that needs examination.

25X1A6b

c. It is stated, among other things, that if the program were intended to prepare reservists to participate in unconventional warfare operations then the program is entirely inadequate. It is stated that unconventional warfare is a highly specialized field in which superficial knowledge is more dangerous than total ignorance. However, the acknowledged training objective was to acquaint these officers with unconventional warfare not to make them unconventional warfare officers and also to give them an appreciation of the very complexity of the subject. In a sense to single out this one program as being inadequate and as not meeting the specific objectives of an undefined Agency hot war mission ignores the entire problem of appropriate training for Agency military reservists. Obviously, the Agency itself would gain little from the military training of reservists solely in their military specialties. Consequently, the training program has been designed in the past as a compromise between strict military specialties and those subjects which a reservists might expect to encounter if he were called to active duty in the Agency itself. To this extent giving officers an exposure to unconventional warfare so that they could gain appreciation of the difficulties and complexities seems more closely related to their potential utilization than many of the other training courses offered reservists.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

d. Part of the problem certainly stems from the undefined Agency hot war mission and the undefined role of the reservists within the Agency. Therefore, the best that can be hoped for is to train those reservists against possible situations that might be encountered. We cannot reach the preciseness which some reserve units have where the individuals are assigned to specific jobs and are trained to do those specific jobs against mobilization.

6. I feel the recommendation concerning a policy that all junior professional officers enter the Agency employ through the JOTP should be qualified by the word "normally." As I understand it this recommendation includes prospective DD/S types in the professional officer category. If, as may from time to time be the case, I wish to recruit for this office from outside the Agency, it would seem unnecessary for such a recruit to go through the full JOTP phase. Such a recruit would be pretty much hand picked and would need only a portion of the JOTP training.

7. Establishment of a JOT Selection Panel composed of line officer representation from the three Deputies appears to be sound. However, I personally doubt the advisability of including outstanding public citizens in the Panel selection process. There is always difficulty in obtaining and getting adequate time from such persons and a question whether they would feel their contribution would be worth the effort.

8. I heartily endorse the recommendation for a mid-career training course and believe it should include considerable emphasis on management and personnel administration.

9. I also believe the recommendation for a senior officer training program makes sense, but particularly on the management side I would aim higher. Thus, on page 151 of the report there is stated, "A budget officer, for example, might make a solid contribution to a discussion of counterintelligence operations" I hope the emphasis would be more on budget implications for intelligence at the Bureau of the Budget level, studies of the policy making machinery of the executive branch, and the relationships with the Congress as they affect the intelligence community. Officers in the grade of GS-15 and above contemplated for this training should have intelligence management know-how and

experience, particularly if the mid-career training is effective, but too many tend to consider the intelligence structure as an "ivory tower" and have not sufficient understanding of its relationship through the whole machinery of Government.

10. I have no particular comment on the other recommendations. As I mentioned in the beginning they have little or no impact on this office. Lawyers who come into the office must have their basic legal training, and any experience they have had since the technical training is grist to the legal mill. Once in the office the main training effort is through supervision of on-the-job training and experience, supplemented by a variety of seminars, courses, and specialties, such as taxation and foreign corporate legal problems. The lawyers also keep abreast of developments by reading law journals, law reviews, and similar publications, which is necessary in any type of practice. The only action needed from the Office of Training is in connection with the special courses and outside seminars, in which they are most cooperative. Also, for the most part, such courses luckily tend to be quite inexpensive.

11. As a final comment it is interesting to note that the concept of Government sponsored training is a comparatively new one outside of the armed forces. As late as the close of World War II the general Government philosophy was that people had to equip themselves for their jobs where any formal training was required. The passage of the Government Employees Training Act is evidence that the Government has realized how essential it is to maintain extensive training programs for its personnel. This Agency with its unique problems, to a large extent unknown outside the intelligence community and often not too well recognized from within, needs such training programs perhaps more than any other component of the Government. The Inspector General's report is valuable in that it strongly supports this thesis and insists that recognition of the necessity for training must be given by supervisors at all levels.

s/ Lawrence R. Houston

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON
General Counsel